

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended, and claims 25-27 have been added. Claims 1-19 and 25-27 remain for further consideration. No new matter has been added.

The objections and rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

2. Claims 1, 2, 7-13 and 17-19 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the subject matter disclosed in U.S. Patent 4,780,909 to Sakashita (hereinafter “Sakashita”).

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 recites a television receiver that includes:

“a tuner that receives a transmitted signal from an antenna and bandshifts the transmitted signal to an intermediate frequency and provides a received signal indicative thereof;

a selective filter stage that receives the received signal containing chrominance and luminance components and provides a filtered signal; (emphasis added, cl. 1).

The Official Action contends that Sakashita discloses each of the features of claim 1 with the exception of: (i) an antenna for obtaining RF signals and (ii) that stage 12 is a “filter” stage. (Official Action, pg. 3). However, there are a number of other patentable differences between the claimed invention and the subject matter disclosed in Sakashita.

First, the Official Action alleges that the tuner 1 in Sakashita reads on the tuner set forth in claim 1 (see Official Action, pg. 3). The Official Action then alleges that the first stage 12 within the tuner 1 of Sakashita reads on the claimed selective filter stage. However, this rejection is clearly improper since the Official Action alleges that the tuner 1 of Sakashita reads

on the claimed tuner, and then alleges that an element of the tuner 1 of Sakashita reads on the claimed selective stage. The tuner 1 of Sakashita can not be used to read on one element of the claimed invention, while the sub-element of the tuner 1 (i.e., the first stage 12) is used to read on a separate element of the claimed invention.

Second, claim 1 recites that the selective filter stage receives the received signal, which has been bandshifted to an IF frequency. In contrast, the input tuning circuit 12 of Sakashita operates on the received signal, which has not been bandshifted to IF. Specifically, as shown in FIG. 1 of Sakashita the bandshifting does not occur until the mixer 15. Therefore, the input tuning circuit 15 of Sakashita is clearly incapable of reading on the selective filter stage recited in claim 1 since Sakashita neither discloses nor suggests operating on a received signal that is an IF signal.

Third, the Official Action acknowledges that the input tuning circuit 12 of Sakashita fails to disclose filtering (see Official Action, pg. 3). However, the Official Action then contends that *“although Sakashita does not specify stage 12 as a “filter” stage, it is noted that filtering is a broad term defined by the reduction of data relative to initial data. The processing of stage 12, prompted by control stage 9, involves the reduction of differences among desired frequency characteristics (e.g., col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 3). In view of this, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to consider the processing performed by stage 12 as a filtering process in a basic sense, thereby meeting claim 11.”* (Official Action, pg. 3). It is respectfully submitted that a fair and proper reading of Sakashita as a whole fails to provide such a suggestion. Specifically, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to provide a filter stage whose filtering characteristics are modifiable by the control signal since the input tuning circuit of Sakashita sees and provides an HF signal, rather than operating on an IF signal.

Of course, providing such filtering for HF signals is much more complicated due to noise issues – that is, the signal that the input tuning circuit 12 of Sakashita operates on still contains the carrier signal and thus is at a much higher frequency in contrast to an IF signal. One of ordinary skill in the art would certainly not look to perform selective filtering of an HF signal.

Fourth, the Official Action further contends *“since the receiver is capable of receiving television, it would have been obvious to receive composite signals characterized by color and luminance components, color television being very well known and typically provided by the high majority of broadcasters. Single input terminal 11 and the signal processing channel would accordingly handle the composite chrominance/luminance signal.”* (Official Action, pages 3-4). The undersigned attorney can not accept the contention set forth in the preceding sentence as judicial notice. In fact, Sakashita never even discloses that the tuner disclosed therein is a television tuner. The term television or TV is only mentioned in col. 1 of Sakashita, and that single occurrence is simply in the title of a prior art reference.

For any of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Sakashita is incapable of rendering claim 1 obvious.

CLAIM 11

Claim 11 recites a television receiver that includes:

“a tuner that receives a transmitted signal from an antenna and bandshifts the transmitted signal to an intermediate frequency and provides a received signal indicative thereof;

a first selective filter stage that receives and filters the received signal to provide a filtered signal, wherein the selective filter stage implements a transfer function that is modifiable by one or more control signals derived from a field strength signal; and” (emphasis added, cl. 11).

The Official Action contends that Sakashita discloses each of the features of claim 1 with the exception of: (i) an antenna for obtaining RF signals and (ii) that stage 12 is a "filter" stage. (Official Action, pg. 3). It is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

3. The undersigned notes the additional prior art of record and agrees that these references neither anticipate nor render obvious (either alone or in combination) the subject matter of the claimed invention.

4. The indication that claims 3-6 and 14-16 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten to no longer depend from a rejected base claim is noted and appreciated.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-19 and 25-27 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. O'Shea
Reg. No. 35,305
O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C.
1500 Main Street, Suite 912
Springfield, MA 01115
(413) 731-3100, Ext. 102